

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The dates, Sir.

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The dates are not available, Sir. I have said that the orders were issued in October 1956 and that the possession has been handed over to the Revenue Department only recently.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—On what dates?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—I said that possession was handed over only recently. It might be a month or two ago. I am not in a position to give the exact date.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Would Government tell me the reasons for the inordinate delay in handing over possession of land by the Amrit Mahal Department to the Revenue Department?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The Hon'ble Member knows it very well that when the order was passed and enquiries made, a number of people were in possession of the land. Orders were passed in October 1956 and the Animal Husbandry Department took some time to examine this question and demarcate the areas that is to be allowed to the Revenue Department and that is to be given to the Animal Husbandry Department?

ಶ್ರೀ ಪರಮೇಶ್ವರ ಪ್ಪ.—ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಸಾಗುವಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆ ಈ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ನಡೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹುಲ್ಲುಗಾವಲುಗಳು ಕಡಮೆ ಇವೆ ಎನ್ನುವುದು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದಿದೆಯೇ?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—That question will also be considered.

Sri A. R. BADRI NARAYAN.—It is stated in answer (b) that the arable land will be disposed of as per rules. What rules would Government bring to ensure that only deserving people get the land?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—The land revenue rules are there and the Government is also revising these rules. The land will be distributed to the deserving people according to the rules.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—Government were pleased to say that they intend starting co-operative farming. Would Government tell me their experience of co-operative farming in Mysore?

Sri M. P. PATIL.—Yes, we have experience.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—What is that experience?

Mr. SPEAKER.—That is a different question altogether.

Delay in publication of Amended Industrial Disputes Act.

Q.—284. **Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN** (Kolar Gold Fields).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the date on which the Amended Industrial Disputes Act came into force in the State of Mysore;

(b) the reasons for the delay in publishing the Industrial Disputes Rules as required;

(c) whether they have received representations regarding the inconvenience caused to labour by not appointing an Industrial Tribunal in time as required under the Industrial Disputes Act;

(d) whether they are aware that the Industrial Tribunal appointed under the old I. D. Act did not function for the past several months;

(e) the number of cases that are pending for disposal?

A.—**Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA** (Minister for Labour and Legal Affairs).—

(a) 10th March 1957.

(b) They were under scrutiny.

(c) Yes.

(d) Yes.

(e) 62.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Supplementary to (a), Sir. Is it true that the Government of Mysore published draft rules as far back as December 1956 and the Government of India brought the Central Industrial Disputes Act in force on 10th March, Sir?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—Notification dated 18th June 1957, which I have with me, gives all particulars and refers to the notification the Hon'ble Member refers to, i.e., 17th December

(SRI B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA)
1956 as required by sub-section 17 of the said section. I can hand that document to the Hon'ble Member, Sir.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—The Hon'ble Minister has said in answer to supplementary (d) that the matter was under consideration between December and 17th June, Sir. Is that a fact?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The rules had to be framed and had to be scrutinised. The scrutiny took some time, because they had to be very carefully done and the publication was done on the 18th June.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Is it not true that draft rules published in December and the final rules published in June are just the same, word for word, and comma for comma?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—In the light of the new enactments, further scrutiny of the rules had to be done. If the scrutiny did not require any change, it does not mean that scrutiny did not merit the time.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Was there not a direction from the Government of India that the whole Act should be brought as early as possible into force, that is, not later than March 1957 itself?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—All directions given by the Central Government have been duly complied with.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—With reference to answer (d), may I know why did not the Industrial Tribunal appointed under the Old Industrial Disputes Act function?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—The Tribunal that was appointed under the old Act was composed of three persons and it is not right to say that it did not function. Of the three members, unfortunately, one fell ill and it was not known when he would recover. Time elapsed and it went on like that. Tribunal could not function without the other person recovering. Thus some time was lost.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—Is it not a fact that the member who fell ill was again made the Chairman of the

Tribunal? I mean, the person who resigned was made the Chairman.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—There is considerable confusion in the question put. If the member says that the person who was ill was appointed Chairman again, it is entirely wrong. If he means that the member who resigned has been appointed, there is also some confusion. The Tribunal that was constituted under the old Act is totally different from the Tribunal under the new Act. Formerly, it was a Tribunal composed of three persons. Now, it is a Tribunal composed of one person.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—May I know the reason for the resignation of the Member from that Tribunal?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—It was found that it could not function with one person. There was one Hon'ble Member continuing and drawing salary in the Tribunal. He resigned out of generosity and it is a laudable thing that he did it.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA.—Has it come to the notice of the Government that it is not possible to decide 62 cases within a short time? Will they therefore constitute another Tribunal?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—It is a matter of opinion. I am watching it with keen interest and if I find it necessary to constitute another, I will not hesitate to appoint it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—When was this appointment made?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I could not tell the exact date. Recently he has taken charge and begun to function.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—Is it not true that the Labour Court appointed under this Act has not started functioning?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—This point has been dealt with the other day and I have answered already. I have nothing more to add to it.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN.—How could that be possible? There can be only a specific answer to a specific question. Why should I refer to some proceedings of the previous day?

Mr. SPEAKER.—I suppose the memory of the Hon'ble Member is not short.

Sri C. J. MUCKANNAPPA.—May I know the qualifications of the Members of this Tribunal?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—As I have already informed the House on the other occasion, he should be either a Judge of the High Court, or a retired Judge or a Chairman of the Tribunal who functioned for two years or a Member who functioned for two years in a Tribunal.

ಶ್ರೀ ಡಿ. ಬಿ. ಸೀತಾರಾಮರಾವ್.—ಈ 62 ಪ್ರಕರಣಗಳು ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಂದ ಮುಂದುವರಿದಿವೆ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—For varying periods.

Sri G. DUGGAPPA.—Is it a fact that being a retired Minister is a necessary qualification for being appointed as one of the Members of the Tribunal.

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I repudiate the suggestion.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member may ask what are the qualifications.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಚ್. ಜಿ. ನರಸಿಂಹೇಗೌಡ.—ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯಲ್ ಟ್ರೈಬ್ಯುನಲ್‌ನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಲು ತಡೆದುಡರಿಂದ, ಲೇಬರ್‌ಗೆ ಸ್ಲಾಟ್‌ಕ್ಕೆ ಹಕ್ಕುಬಾಧ್ಯತೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಧಕ್ಕೆ ಉಂಟಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—I do not think the question should have been put at all.

Sri L. S. VENKAJI RAO.—Is not one man Tribunal constituted elsewhere in other States?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—It is the Statute that provides for it. It is binding upon all the States.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಎ. ಬಸವೇಗೌಡ.—ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯಲ್ ಟ್ರೈಬ್ಯುನಲ್‌ನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಲು ತಡೆವಾಯಿತು

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೀರಿ. ಅವರು ಅವಾರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ರಿಟ್ರಾ ಸ್ಟಕ್ವಿವ್ ಆಗಿ ಕೊಟ್ಟರೆ, ಎಂಪ್ಲಾಯರ್‌ಗೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಯಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೇ?

Sri B. VAIKUNTA BALIGA.—There is no question of loss. I do not understand how the loss would arise.

Cases are pending for various periods. If the cases are decided, adjudication will date back to the commencement of the enquiry. If the Hon'ble Member makes the question more clear, I will try to answer.

Establishment and the Work done by the City Improvement Trust Board.

Q.—346. Sri K. V. BYRE GOWDA (Bangalore North).—

Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(a) the expenditure incurred on the establishment of the City Improvement Trust Board in Bangalore since its inception to 31st December 1956 (yearwise expenditure may be furnished);

(b) the number of layouts it did and the revenue it has brought;

(c) the actual amount for acquisition of lands paid and the amount spent on constructing the layouts and other expenditures incurred towards formation of sites in these layouts, and the amounts they realised by selling those sites may be furnished on each layout and extension block?

A.—Sri R. CHENNIGARAMIAH (Minister for Local Self-Government).—

(a) Statement 'A' appended.

(b) and (c) Statement 'B' appended.